

Y. Sawada  
U.S. Serial No. 10/049,315  
Page 2 of 3

The History and Style documents, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a body data unit including a first identifier for designating contents displayed on a display region, as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 17, and 18.

In the Final Office Action of 03/08/2006, the <BODY> tag in the History document was cited as allegedly corresponding to Applicant's claimed "body data unit" (see Final Office Action at page 3, first paragraph). However, the History document does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed "first identifier for designating contents displayed on a display region." All of the independent claims require the body data unit to include "a first identifier for designating contents displayed on a display region."

On page 3 of the Final Office Action, it was admitted that the History document does not disclose the part data unit "including a file name of display data divided into a plurality of regions with the first identifier added thereto," or the display data "entered as an object separately from the body data unit."

The style sheets disclosed in the Style document were cited for allegedly teaching the Applicant's claimed "part data unit" including a file name of display data. Referring to pages 6-7 of the Style document, the style sheets can be combined with an HTML document (see, e.g., Style at page 6, last paragraph).

However, the style sheets disclosed in the Style document constitute *display attributes*, not the display data itself, and thus do not correspond to the Applicant's claimed "part data unit," where claim 1, for example, recites "display data divided into a plurality of regions with said first identifier added thereto."

Moreover, the Style document does not teach or suggest a "first identifier." As claimed, the first identifier must be present in the body data unit "for designating contents displayed on a display region," where the first identifier is added to the part data unit.

Y. Sawada  
U.S. Serial No. 10/049,315  
Page 3 of 3

Regarding claims 5, 20, and 22, on page 6 of the Final Office Action, it was alleged that the Form reference "discloses a plurality of display forms" in column 10, lines 30-41 (see Final Office Action at page 6, last full paragraph).

The Form reference is directed to a method for viewing electronically stored documents at different speeds (see column 2, lines 15-28 of Form), where FIG. 1 depicts a browsing device with a double-faced page display, and FIG. 4 depicts a single page display.

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in column 10, lines 30-41 or anywhere else in the Form reference of event data "corresponding to a plurality of forms" (claim 5), where such forms include a double-page spread display-dedicated event, a single-spread display-dedicated event and an event executable for both a double-page spread display and a single page display (claims 20 and 22).


For at least the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of the History and Style documents does not teach or suggest the Applicant's claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1, 8, 15, 17, and 18. Moreover, the Form and Kikinis references fail to remedy the deficiencies of the History and Style documents.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 6, 2006

By:

  
Steven M. Jensen  
(Reg. No. 42,693)

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 439-4444

Customer No. 21874